R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 011 549 VT 001 564

WESTERN REGIONAL RCU CONFERENCE IN VOCATIONAL RESEARCH FUNDING (PHOENIX, DECEMBER 15-16, 1966). SUMMARY REPORT.

BY- LEE, ARTHUR M. AND OTHERS
NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIV., FLAGTAFF

B
PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$0.76 19P.

DESCRIPTORS- CONFERENCES, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, *RESEARCH COORDINATING UNITS, *EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH, *FINANCIAL SUPPORT, REGIONAL LABORATORIES, *EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION, FEDERAL AID, STATE AID, VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1963, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT, MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT, ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT, PHOENIX

RESEARCH COORDINATING UNIT PERSONNEL MET TO CONSIDER THE FUNDING OF VOCATIONAL RESEARCH. THE PURPOSE WAS TO EXPLORE ALTERNATE SOURCES OF FUNDS BECAUSE OF DECREASED APPROPRIATIONS. PARTICIPANTS REPRESENTED LOCAL STATE AND FEDERAL SOURCES OF RESEARCH FUNDING. QUESTIONS CONSIDERED WERE -- (1) HOW MUCH MONEY WILL BE AVAILABLE FOR RESEARCH THIS YEAR AND NEXT, (2) HOW WILL IT BE DISTRIBUTED, (3) WHAT PROCEDURES SHOULD BE FOLLOWED IN REQUESTING FUNDS, (4) WHAT CRITERIA WILL BE USED IN EVALUATING REQUESTS, (5) WHAT PROCEDURES WILL BE FOLLOWED IN PROCESSING REQUESTS, AND (6) HOW MAY THESE FUNDS BE USED. THE SESSION TOPICS WERE--(1) DIRECTED RESEARCH UNDER TITLE IV(C) OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT, (2) RESEARCH FUNDS ADMINISTERED BY THE STATES, (3) SMALL GRANTS FROM RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT UNDER TITLE IV(C) OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT, (4) COORDINATION OF TITLE III PROGRAMS UNDER THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT WITH STATE RESEARCH COORDINATING UNITS, (5) COORDINATING VOCATIONAL RESEARCH WITH THE REGIONAL EXPERIMENTAL LABORATORIES, (6) RESEARCH FUNDING AVAILABLE UNDER THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM, AND (7) FUNDING RESEARCH UNDER TITLE I OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT. (MS)

ED011549

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

WESTERN REGIONAL RCU CONFERENCE ON VOCATIONAL RESEARCH FUNDING

Phoenix, Arizona
December 15-16, 1966

Summary Report

Sponsored By
Arizona Research Coordinating Unit
Northern Arizona University

VT 015 561

SUMMARY REPORT

Purpose of the Conference

A conference of RCU personnel from the Western States was held in Flagstaff, Arizona in November, 1965, nearly six months after the initial RCU's were established. At that time mutual interests were discussed and communications established which have proven beneficial. At the meeting of the RCU directors in Washington, D. C. in September, 1966 several of the Western States directors felt that another regional meeting was needed. The Arizona RCU again agreed to sponsor this conference. After consulting with the Division of Adult and Vocational Research and other RCU directors it was decided that the conference should deal specifically with vocational research funding. Congress had reduced the 4(c) appropriations for vocational research, and at the same time the Elementary and Secondary Education Act had provided additional research programs which might be of assistance to vocational education. The purpose of this conference, therefore, was to explore alternate sources of funding vocational research.

Program participants were selected to represent each of the logical sources of research funding, both at the federal and state levels. These included the Adult and Vocational Research Division of the Office of Education; regional offices of vocational education; state departments of vocational education; the regional laboratories at Denver, Salt Lake City, Albuquerque and Los Angeles under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; the Title III program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; the Economic Opportunity Act; and the Labor Department. Letters addressed to the participants requested in as far as possible information in response to the following questions:

How much money will be available for research this year? Next year?

How will these funds be distributed?

What procedures are to be followed in requesting these funds?

What criteria will be used in evaluating requests?

What procedures will be followed in processing requests?

For what purposes may these funds be used?

The specific purposes of the conference thus were to assess the availability of research funds from the most logical sources; the procedures to be followed in gaining access to such funds; and the best ways to coordinate the activities of the RCU's in developing vocational research with other state and federal programs.

Procedures

The conference consisted of seven general sessions: two luncheons, an informal evening discussion session and a wrap-up session. Each of the general sessions lasted one hour and fifteen minutes, with the time divided between presentations by speakers and discussion from the floor. An RCU director acted as a recorder

for each of the general sessions. The wrap-up session consisted of the recorders' summaries presented to the conference, and these were adopted in final form to constitute a document containing the essential information brought out by the speakers and other participants in the conference. The body of this report is that document. A list of the participants and the agenda of the conference are included at the end of the report.

Action by the Conference

Following adoption of the summary report, a motion was made, seconded and passed unanimously that the Research Coordinating Units in the Western States meet in a regional conference each year at approximately this time. A national meeting of RCU personnel has been scheduled each of the past two years in the summer months, and the regional meetings would thus bring the directors and other personnel together for matters of common concern at six month intervals.

A second motion was made, seconded and passed recommending that our next regional meeting be held in January, 1960 in Honolulu. In the discussion of this motion three supporting facts were brought out: mutual benefits will result for the Hawaiian RCU and the other Western State RCU's through this opportunity for closer association; the current war effort with its increasing demands upon military technical training can be observed with unique advantages at Pearl Harbor and the Honolulu area; transportation costs to Honolulu are little more, if any, for Western States personnel than to meetings on the East coast.

A final suggestion by the moderator of the conference is that the Western States RCU's be organized as an association at the next national meeting in Washington. The Association of Western States Research Coordinating Units would thus be in a position to continue coordinating their efforts and maintaining close communications throughout their common geographic area during the period of increasing state responsibility for these activities. The suggested region would include all states west of and including the Great Plains from North Dakota to Texas.

Session I: DIRECTED RESEARCH UNDER TITLE 4(c) OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Speaker: Dr. John Bean, Division of Adult and Vocational Research, U. S. Office of Education

Recorder: Everett D. Edington, California RCU

The following major points were emphasized in this presentation:

1. A major purpose of RCU's in relation to funding is to encourage and obtain use of state and local funds for research. A state should go to the U. S. Government for funds only when the project is too large for a state to handle or it has national implications.

2. The major responsibility of RCU's is that of instrumentation and coordination and not of conducting research.

3. There will be no new 4(c) research projects this fiscal year and it is very likely that any additional funds for next year will not be available before September or October.

4. A small portion of the summer training institutes will be funded this year; $800,000.00 has been set aside for this purpose.

5. The RCU's were cut back less than other projects under 4(c); however, the vocational research program was cut back more than most educational research programs.

6. In many states the state government or university has taken up the slack made by the withdrawal of federal funds from the RCU's.

7. The RCU's should look to other sources for research funds in vocational education. Examples given were industry and private foundations.

Session II: RESEARCH FUNDS ADMINISTERED BY THE STATES: GROUP DISSCUSSION

Moderator: Dr. Arthur M. Lee, Director, Arizona RCU

Recorder: Fred Miner, Washington RCU

1. Directors of several RCU's report their involvement in selecting and evaluating research and development projects funded at the state level from title 4(a) funds. California, Arizona, Oregon, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Utah, and Texas all report significant numbers of vocational R. and D. projects under way with 4(a) funds. In addition they report the involvement of RCU's in this research activity.

2. One state (Utah) reports using earmarked state funds for support of graduate students and others engaged in research in vocational-technical education.

3. Several states use RCU funds matched by state and local funds for the support of R. and D. projects undertaken by local school districts.

4. California has used 4(a) funds for the support of vocational-technical education research seminars.

5. One state (Oklahoma) reports the use of funds received from the Oklahoma Economic Development Council, a state agency for research in Vocational-Technical Education.

RCU personnel reported enthusiastic support of vocational research activities in states where state directors of vocational education, local school district personnel, and university research staff were all involved in the vocational research activity, and where state and local funds were committed to the support of this R. and D. effort.

Session III: SMALL GRANTS FOR RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT UNDER TITLE 4(c) OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT

Speaker: Howard B. Gundersen, Acting Regional Representative, Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education, HEW Regional Office, San Francisco.

Recorder: Gene Schrader, New Mexico RCU

The small project research program as outlined in the presentation by Mr. Gundersen seems to be one of token effort only. It is obvious from the total amount of $1.8 million that few projects from each state can be supported. The Western portion of the United States receives only $664,000. At a $10,000 maximum grant, less than 100 projects can be funded. One-half of the allocation is to be used to support small or medium sized institutions in their research efforts.

Several benefits of a program such as this are apparent:

1. Competition for research monies will be on a regional basis.

2. The turn around time should be much less than the present situation.

3. Projects may be supported that have less than national implications.

4. Readers should be more sympathetic, being regional rather than national.

The Educational Research Advisor (ERA) will have more than token power and every effort needs to be made in each region to insure employment of a person that is sympathetic to vocational education. Every effort needs to be made to obtain more funds in this program.

Only two regional offices are now operational--regions four and five. Other regions need to become operational soon, if the small project program is to be of benefit to the RCU. Until the other regional offices are in operation, proposals should continue to be submitted to Washington. The format for the small grant proposals is the same as for larger proposals.

The project concerning cooperative projects of small colleges and universities has a great deal of merit and should prove fruitful to the RCU. If we, as RCU directors are to adhere to the philosophy of the RCU, we will make every effort to coordinate activities under this program. Three year projects are supported at a maximum level of $50,000 per year. Detailed information concerning this project will be forthcoming from the office of Dr. John Bean.

Session IV: COORDINATION OF TITLE III PROGRAMS UNDER THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY ACT WITH STATE RESEARCH COORDINATING UNITS.

Panel: Calvin Nichols, Program Management Officer on Area Desk V (Title III), San Francisco; James B. Ellingson, Oregon Title III Coordinator, and Wayne Taysom, Arizona Title III.

Recorder: T. A. Ryan, Oregon RCU

1. Federal role, Title III, ESEA
   Title III, ESEA, calls for cooperative program involving local districts, state agency, and federal government.

   A. Purpose of Title III, ESEA

      1. To improve quality of education

      2. To provide supplementary services, not supplanting and not duplicating existing services.

      3. To strengthen 8 areas defined in the act.

   B. Kinds of programs with vocational education implications:
   (Vocational education not mentioned directly)

      1. Projects in following areas:
         a. special education
         b. vocational guidance
         c. continuing education
         d. special programs in rural communities

      2. Cooperative programs involving
         a. regional labs, institutions of higher education, working with local districts on evaluation or demonstration projects, with funding to local district.

      3. Proposals submitted relating to vocational education:
         a. Planning an area vocational school
         b. Developing specifications for building
         c. Planning the curriculum for a new vocational demonstration school
         d. Designing a new program to provide occupational guidance.

C. Guidelines for proposals
Available from USOE, Washington D.C. or ESEA Title III Coordinator, State Department of Education

D. Procedure for proposal processing

1. Applicant

Must be local school district, or intermediate agency

2. Deadlines

January 15, 1967
July 1, 1967

3. Review process

a. Takes 3 months

b. Involves review by panel of experts at state level; final action by national advisory committee.

E. Funds

1. Allocated by states in varying amounts

2. For new projects in January, funds are practically nil.

3. Proposals now cannot get money for construction.

II State Role

A. Mechanics of funding at state level.

1. State does not administer funds.

2. State acts in advisory capacity, recommending proposal for funding and then submitting to Area Desk, Federal office.

3. Advisory committee sets guidelines for recommendation procedure.

B. Proposal processing

1. Proposal submitted simultaneously to state office and USOE

a. 20 copies to USOE

b. five to ten copies to state agency (Oregon, 5 copies - Arizona, 10 copies)

2. State has no funds for administration of Title III. Therefore, state office uses resource people for proposal review. Vocational education staff can be involved in this.

C. Suggestions for vocational education participation in Title III

1. Examples of vocational education programs funded under Title III in Oregon:

   a. Pre-vocational education program for junior high school

   b. Model program for vocational education, grades 7-12 and adults

2. Vocational education could develop programs in single subject matter areas. (USOE priority item)

III Questions

Q. Is it possible for more than one school to go together to conduct a project?

A. Yes. Multi-district participation is encouraged. One district has to be applicant and serve as fiscal agent.

Q. Can universities apply for Title III funds?

A. No. Applicants must be school districts or intermediate school agencies.

Q. Is there a priority list?

A. Yes. There is a state-wide priority list. There also is a district priority. The district must evaluate the priority order of need for the district. Projects proposed should be high on district and state priority lists.

Q. What is the chance of approval of a proposed program?

A. The rate of approval is one in four, with 25% of proposals approved. In Oregon 73 proposals were submitted, with 23 funded.

Q. Can Title III programs be integrated with research projects?

A. Yes. This is encouraged. Most Title III projects are approved on a 3-year basis. There is a good chance of testing research in the demonstration schools or programs. Suggest finding out Title III projects to see how research could tie in with these projects.

Q. How is dissemination accomplished?

A. At state level; there are state summaries which would be available from Coordinator. The proposal must outline the system by which dissemination will be done.

At national level, a publication, PACE, gives summaries of all projects approved under Title III.

When projects are completed, final reports will have to be prepared.

Session V: COORDINATING VOCATIONAL RESEARCH WITH THE REGIONAL EXPERIMENTAL LABORATORIES

Panel: James M. Thrasher, Rocky Mountain Laboratory, Denver; Helmut Hofmann, Rocky Mountain Laboratory, Salt Lake City; James Williams, Southwest Regional Laboratory, Los Angeles (Tempe Office); Paul Potty, Southwestern Laboratory, Albuquerque.

Recorder: John Stephens, Utah RCU

I. Legal Basis of Regional Labs

Title IV of Public Law 89-10 provides the legal basis for the establishment and operation of the Regional Labs.

II. Mission of the Regional Labs

A. General

1. The long-range objective of all the labs is to bring about improvement in elementary and secondary education.

2. A second objective is to expedite improvements in the educational system by reducing the time lag between the completion of research and implementation of the results.

B. Specific

1. The Southwestern Lab in Albuquerque
Priority assigned to articulated programs designed to improve education in the lower elementary grades. Indigenous projects have the lowest priority under present funding. Long-range plan introduces vocational programs at end of second year.

2. The Rocky Mountain Laboratory in Denver/Salt Lake
The Rocky Mountain Lab has five current projects designed to improve learning conditions for children in public schools.
   a. Pre-service teacher education
   b. In-service teacher training
   c. Curricula development for individualized instruction
   d. Development and testing of new instructional media
   e. Affective behavior investigation

3. The Southwest Regional Lab
The Southwest Lab is product oriented in four areas:
   a. Communications skills
   b. Problem solving
   c. Instructional technology
   d. Staff training

III. Difficulties (Problems) faced by Regional Labs

The problems faced by the regional labs can be categorized as follow:

A. Funding

Only unstable, short-term funding is provided. Funds have been greatly reduced from original plan.

B. Organization

Limited short-term funding makes hiring of qualified personnel difficult.

C. Territorial considerations

There has been competition between labs for territorial responsibility. This problem is diminishing.

D. Evaluation

No yardstick exists against which the accomplishments of the labs can be measured; therefore, future funding which is based on productivity becomes even more uncertain.

E. Programs

There are few specific guidelines which can be used by the individual labs in establishing priorities for implementing research programs.

IV. Relationship of labs with RCU's

The RCU's and labs should coordinate their activities to minimize duplication. The labs can offer limited support to the RCU's in such areas as research design; the RCU's can suggest areas for future research to the labs.

Session VI: RESEARCH FUNDING AVAILABLE UNDER THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM

Speaker: Jerome S. Bernstein, Deputy Director, Manpower Division, Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D. C.

Recorder: Ken Loudermilk, Idaho RCU

The following highlights were presented in Mr. Bernstein's address:

1. Research and Demonstration money was reduced by Congress. In Fiscal 1966, this amounted to 15% of total unearmarked money for community action programs. The last Congress reduced this to 5%, or $8.5 to $4.5 million.

2. Two reasons for the above fund cuts — (a) a 25% cut in community action programs over the country due to complex politics and (b) more and more community action money is being earmarked by Congress for specific programs - e.g. the Headstart program.

3. Research and Demonstration program, with $4.5 million, is about holding level with projects already planned, and only some $300,000 is available for initiating new programs. The Labor Department also was cut from $20 to $15 million. Mr. Bernstein suggests the Canadian Proverty Program or the Ford Foundation as sources of funds.

4. Congress has been very "vocal" on Research and Demonstration programs. R & D funds have been used for innovative purposes rather than for Research and Development per se. Consequently, Congress mandated that the R & D programs be more "pure" and also show an impact on poverty programs for the poor.

5. The Office of Economic Opportunity admittedly has a vested interest in the poor. OEO program established because existing institutions and programs were not doing a satisfactory job with the Hard-Core poor, especially.

6. An effort has been made to improve conditions of the poor, but success has been minimal. There is a real need to "turn off the faucet", and help schools and other institutions to stop turning out illiterate and untrained people.

7. Manpower Priorities were discussed, as follow:

   a. Rural Models: Rural poor people have not received too much help. Not much known about how to train them, or how to get them employed afterwards. Problems of geographic mobility also loom large and complex.

   b. Hard-Core Poor: Those who are functional illiterates, school dropouts before grade 6, etc. are difficult to work with. Training frequently results in menial jobs which still do not lift the person above the poverty line. Methods of training also need further development to be effective. Other programs (such as MDTA) do not effectively reach this group.

   c. Manpower Program Evaluation System: Evaluations of training programs usually have resulted in cursory, peripheral statistics only. Qualitative evidence is needed.

8. A need exists to coordinate Research and Demonstration activities of several Federal agencies, such as the OEO, Labor Department, Office of Education, etc.

9. The Greenleigh report was discussed - a comparative study of three types of teaching personnel using four systems of reading to instruct adults with less than 5th grade reading level. One result of note was that high school graduates with no college or teaching experience achieved significantly better results. This should be interpreted cautiously, and reports are available through Mr. Bernstein for our own examination and conclusions.

10. Question period. An effort will be made to improve dissemination of research reports. Hard-core poverty groups reached best through various motivational incentive systems, rather than through coercive programs. The problem with hard-core poverty groups may not be so much a lack of training know-how on the part of those working with these people as the problem of getting them into semi-skilled or higher jobs after training which will provide them suitable status, income, satisfaction, etc.

Session VII: FUNDING RESEARCH UNDER TITLE I OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Speaker: Sheridan Maitland, Office of Manpower Policy Evaluation and Research, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.

Recorder: J. Clark Davis, Nevada RCU

There are four areas of research in this program. They are as follow:

1. Contractual Research. This is the largest of the four. Actually, research will be accepted which is relevant to any area of manpower. There is not a priority for research; however, the booklet "Manpower Research Projects" gives some good clues. Send in general ideas for review before developing a complete proposal. In general the accepted amount for proposals has been around $75,000, although the range is from $10,000 to $300,000. Approximately $2.6 has been set aside for this area of research.

2. Grants to Scholars in Universities. Research should be focused on a special interest to the scholar dealing with manpower. These grants are limited to $10,000.

3. Doctoral Dissertion Grants. Grants are given in this area up to $10,000.

4. Manpower Research Institutional Grants. According to Maitland, this is the area of greatest potential. Grants amounting to $75,000 per year are given to universities who develop programs of research to implement manpower in their regional area. At present grants are distributed partially on the basis of identifying small colleges that would benefit from grant funds in the area of manpower. Grant funds are committed for the next three years to seven projects.

Money available for all research in the four programs is about $3.0 million per year. Mr. Maitland mentioned that other funds are available for special manpower programs called "Experimental Demonstration Programs." Mr. Seymour Brandwine is the person to contact.

Other information concerning manpower projects is that from three to four months time should be allowed for approval.

Mr. Maitland brought with him for distribution the booklet, "Manpower Research Projects through June 30, 1966," sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. This booklet is valuable because of its description of on-going research. Also it contains a guide for developing proposals.

WESTERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON VOCATIONAL RESEARCH FUNDING
Phoenix, Arizona
December 15-16, 1966

List of Participants

CHESTER B. AINSWORTH
Dean, School of Applied Science and Technology
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, Arizona

JOHN BEAN
Specialist, Division of Adult and Vocational Research
U. S. Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue
Washington, D. C.

JEROME S. BERNSTEIN
Deputy Director
Manpower Division--CAP
Office of Economic Opportunity
Executive Office of the President
Washington, D. C. 20506

BILL WESLEY BROWN
Professor of Industrial Education
Faculty Box 4122
Northern Arizona University
Flagstaff, Arizona

WALTER C. BROWN
Division of Industrial Design and Technology
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

J. R. CULLISON
State Director of Vocational Education
412 Arizona State Building
Phoenix, Arizona

J. CLARK DAVIS
Director, Nevada RCU
University of Nevada
Reno, Nevada

EVERETT D. EDINGTON
Coordinator, California RCU
Department of Education
1320 K Street, Room 459
Sacramento, California 95814

JAMES B. ELLINGSON
Coordinator, Title III, ESEA
State Department of Education
Public Service Building
Salem, Oregon 97310

HOWARD B. GUNDERSEN
Acting Regional Representative
Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education
Federal Office Building
50 Fulton Street
San Francisco, California 94102

EDWARD HELER
Manpower Economist Supervisor
Arizona State Employment Service
P. O. Box 6339
Phoenix, Arizona 85005

DONALD D. HISERODT
Supervisor, Manpower
State Department of Vocational Education
412 Arizona State Building
Phoenix, Arizona

HELMUT HOFMANN
Director, Research Planning and Evaluation
Rocky Mountain Educational Lab, Inc.
1540 University Club Building
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

HAROLD B. HUNNICUTT
Assistant Dean, Graduate College
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona

DELBERT R. JEROME
Supervisor of Guidance
State Department of Vocational Education
1333 West Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona

ROBERT L. JONES
Manager, Employee Development
Arizona Public Service Co.
P. O. Box 2591
Phoenix, Arizona 85002

List of Participants, cont.

WILLIAM A. LANGBEHN
Assistant Director, Arizona RCU
1439 North First Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

ARTHUR M. LEE
Director, Arizona RCU
1439 North First Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85004

AL LINDSTROM
Apprenticeship and Training Rep.
Bureau of Apprenticeship & Training
U. S. Department of Labor
130 South Scott Street, Room 112
Tucson, Arizona

ROBERT W. LLOYD
Research Analyst
Arizona State Employment Service
P. O. Box 6339
Phoenix, Arizona 85005

KENNETH M. LOUDERMILK
Director, Idaho RCU
Administration Building, 201-B
University of Idaho
Moscow, Idaho 83843

DAVID LYNN
Coordinator, Hawaii RCU
University of Hawaii Community
College System
2327 Dole Street
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

SHERIDAN MAITLAND
Office of Manpower Policy Evaluation
and Research
U. S. Department of Labor
211 Green Street
Alexandria, Virginia

FRED MINER
Washington RCU
State Capitol Building
Olympia, Washington

OSCAR MILLICAN
Assistant Director, Texas RCU
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas 78711

CALVIN NICHOLS
Program Management Officer
Area Desk V, Title III ESEA
Federal Office Building
50 Fulton Street
San Francisco, California 94102

WILLIAM NIGHTWINE
Wyoming Research Coordinating Unit
State Department of Education
Capitol Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

DANIEL NOBLE (Luncheon Speaker)
Group Executive Vice President
Motorola, Inc.
5005 East McDowell Road
Phoenix, Arizona

BRUCE PERRYMAN
Director, Wyoming RCU
State Department of Education
Capitol Building
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

PAUL PETTY
Southwestern Cooperative Educational
Laboratory, Inc.
P. O. Box 4266
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106

GEORGE PILANT
Washington RCU
State Capitol Building
Olympia, Washington

DENNIS PORTER
Lsi Service Corporation
Consultant for the U. S. Office of OEO
Executive Office of the President
Washington, D. C. 20506

T. ANTOINETTE RYAN
Director, Oregon RCU
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

GENE SCHRADER
Director, New Mexico RCU
Captiol Building
Santa Fe, New Mexico

JOHN F. STEPHENS
Director, Utah RCU
1400 University Club Building
136 East South Temple
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

BILL STEVENSON
Coordinator, Oklahoma RCU
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma

WAYNE TAYSON
Title III Coordinator
Arizona State Department of
Public Instruction
1333 West Camelback Road
Phoenix, Arizona

JAMES M. THRASHER
Director, Rocky Mountain Educational
Laboratory, Inc.
105 Fillmore Street
Denver, Colorado 80206

EDWARD WISE
Coordinator of Research
University of Arizona
Tucson, Arizona

F. R. VIHEL
Employment Manager, AiResearch
402 South 36 Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85034

MORRISON WARREN (Luncheon Speaker)
Principal, Booker T. Washington School
1209 East Jefferson
Phoenix, Arizona

H. H. YOUNG
Research Foundation of Kansas
708 KPL Tower
818 Kansas Avenue
Topeka, Kansas 66612

JAMES WILLIAMS
Southwest Regional Laboratory
1000 Apache Boulevard
Tempe, Arizona

AGENDA
WESTERN REGIONAL CONFERENCE ON VOCATIONAL RESEARCH FUNDING
Los Olivos Lodge, Phoenix, Arizona
December 15-16, 1966

Thursday, December 15

8:30 - 9:00	REGISTRATION
9:00 - 10:15	DIRECTED RESEARCH UNDER TITLE 4(c) OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT Dr. John Bean, Division of Adult and Vocational Research, U. S. Office of Education
10:15 - 10:30	COFFEE
10:30 - 11:45	RESEARCH FUNDS ADMINISTERED BY THE STATES: GROUP DISCUSSION Moderator: Dr. Arthur M. Lee, Director, Arizona RCU
12:15 - 1:30	LUNCHEON Speaker: *Dr. Morrison Warren, Principal of Booker T. Washington School, and Phoenix City Councilman "THE DISADVANTAGED CHILD"
1:45 - 3:00	SMALL GRANTS FOR RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT UNDER TITLE 4(c) OF THE VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT Howard B. Gundersen, Acting Regional Representative Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education, HEW Regional Office, San Francisco
3:00 - 3:15	COFFEE
3:15 - 4:30	COORDINATION OF TITLE III PROGRAMS UNDER THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT WITH STATE RESEARCH COORDINATING UNITS Panel: Calvin Nichols, Program Management Officer on Area Desk V (Title III) Wayne Taysom, Title III Coordinator, Arizona State Department of Public Instruction James B. Ellingson, Title III Coordinator, Oregon State Department of Education
4:30 - 7:00	FREE TIME
7:00 - 10:00	INFORMAL DISCUSSION SESSION All Participants Invited

*Dr. Warren is a prominent Phoenix educator and civic leader, with a strong interest in vocational education for disadvantaged youth.

Friday, December 16, 1966

9:00 - 10:15	COORDINATING VOCATIONAL RESEARCH WITH THE REGIONAL EXPERIMENTAL LABORATORIES Panel: James M. Thrasher, Rocky Mountain Laboratory, Denver Helmut Hofmann, Rocky Mountain Lab., Salt Lake City James Williams, Southwest Regional Laboratory, Los Angeles (Tempe Office) Paul Petty, Southwestern Laboratory, Albuquerque
10:15 - 10:30	COFFEE
10:30 - 11:45	RESEARCH FUNDING AVAILABLE UNDER THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM Jerome S. Bernstein, Deputy Director, Manpower Division, Office of Economic Opportunity, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D. C.
12:15 - 1:30	LUNCHEON Speaker: *Dr. Daniel E. Noble, Vice Chairman of the Board and Chief Technical Officer, Motorola, Inc.
1:45 - 3:00	FUNDING RESEARCH UNDER TITLE I OF THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT Sheridan Maitland, Office of Manpower Policy Evaluation and Research, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington, D. C.
3:00 - 3:15	COFFEE
3:15 - 4:30	SUMMARY REPORT OF THE SEVEN GENERAL SESSIONS Panel: Conference Recorders (Representatives from seven different RCU's)

*Dr. Noble has overall charge of four technical divisions of Motorola, which include the total operations in Arizona. He is an internationally known industrial leader, former educator, and outstanding public speaker.

END

DEPT. OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
U.S. OFFICE OF
EDUCATION

ERIC

DATE FILMED

11·1·67